

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-2 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wada (US 6,532,202).

Claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Revelli, Jr. (US 5,276,745).

Claims 4-10 and 14-20 stand objected to under 37 CRF 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 4-10 and 14-20. Accordingly, claims 1-20 are pending for further consideration.

Claim Objections

Claims 4-10 and 14-20 stand objected to under 37 CRF 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 4-10 and 14-20. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 4-10 and 14-20 be withdrawn.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-2 and 11-12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wada (US 6,532,202), and claims 3 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wada in view of Revelli, Jr. (US 5,276,745). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on grounds that the combination of applied references, whether taken singly or

combined, does not teach or suggest the features recited by at least independent claims 1 and 11.

Independent claims 1 and 11 recite an apparatus wherein at least one of the transparent electrode layer is arranged on an antireflective body comprising a substrate, and a *finestructure* which is formed on the substrate and which has a concave-convex structure (emphasis added). In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Wada merely discloses an antireflective film having a *planar* structure, which does not and can not have a finestructure nor a concave-convex structure for proper operation. The Office Action alleges the antireflective films 112-115 have saw-tooth structures as shown in FIG. 14. Applicants respectfully disagree. The saw-tooth shapes shown in FIG. 14 are merely crosshatchings in order to distinguish layers 112-115 from other layers and are not to be construed as the actual shape of the layers 112-115. Thus, the geometric shapes represented in FIG. 14 have no meaning relative to the surface shapes of the layers 112-115. Specifically, FIG. 14 shows that layers 22 and 24 are made of the same material (denoted as left tilted shade), layers 21 and 27 are made of the same material (denoted as right tilted shade), layers 110 and 111 are made of the same material (denoted as vertical shade), and layers 112-115 are made of the same material (denoted as saw-tooth shade). In column 21, line 60 of Wada, an equation (Eq. 2) for refractive index matching is introduced. By choosing a material that has a refractive index n2 according to Eq. 2, the refractive index between the antireflective film (any one of layers 112-115) and the surrounding layers are matched. One of ordinary skill in the art would immediately know that the antireflective film (any one of layers 112-115) must be planar in order for the condition in Eq. 2 to be valid. The presence of any finestructure or a concave-convex structure in the antireflective film would lead to a condition

where the boundary conditions are not suitable for Eq. 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Wada fails to teach or suggest the combination of features recited by at least independent claims 1 and 11. In addition, Applicants respectfully assert that Revelli, Jr. can not remedy the deficiencies of Wada.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) and 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied prior art references, whether taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claims 1, 11 and hence dependent claims 2-10 and 12-20.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner believe that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 042715-5015
Application No.: 10/527,053
Page 10

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: 

David B. Hardy
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: August 4, 2006

Customer No. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000